

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

By the present amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 12-14. Claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-14 presently stand rejected.

The present Amendment addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Formalities

The Examiner has acknowledged Applicant's claim to foreign priority and has indicated receipt of the certified copy of the Priority Document.

The Examiner has returned the initialed Form PTO/SB/08 filed with the Information Disclosure Statement on February 22, 2005, indicating that all the references cited therein have been considered.

The Examiner has indicated acceptance of the drawing figures filed on February 22, 2005.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the merits of the Examiner's rejection, and merely in an effort to expedite prosecution, claim 13 has been amended, as set forth above, to more clearly recite the feature of "[a] computer-readable storage medium comprising instructions for causing a printing apparatus... to perform a method..." Applicant submits that amended claim 13 clearly satisfies that requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 and, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-10, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Oda (5,277,506). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

According to the MPEP, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” (MPEP § 2131). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-10, 12 and 14 positively recite limitations which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Oda.

A. Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites (among other things):

...a fixed guide;
a movable guide that is movable in said scanning direction; and
a sensor that detects an edge that is guided by said fixed guide, in said scanning direction, of said medium to be printed...

The grounds of rejection allege that the paper lateral end sensor 11, as disclosed in Oda, corresponds to “a sensor,” as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 1 requires the feature of a sensor that detects an edge that is guided by a fixed guide, in said scanning direction, of said medium to be printed. However, Oda provides no disclosure or suggestion that the paper lateral end sensor 11 detects an edge that is guided by a fixed guide, as claimed. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Oda for *at least* these reasons.

In addition, claim 1 recites the feature of a movable guide that is movable in said scanning direction. However, Oda also fails to provide any disclosure or suggestion whatsoever

regarding a movable guide, as claimed. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Oda for *at least* these reasons. Further, Applicant submits that the dependent claims 2-10 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

B. Independent Claim 12

Independent claim 12 recites (among other things):

...a fixed guide;
a movable guide that is movable in said scanning direction; and
a sensor detects an edge that is guided by said fixed guide, in said scanning direction, of said medium to be printed...

In view of the similarity between these requirements and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claim 12. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over the cited Oda reference *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Thus, the allowance of this claim is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

C. Independent Claim 14

Independent claim 14 requires (among other things):

...a step of preparing a printing apparatus having a fixed guide, and a movable guide that is movable in a scanning direction;
a step of detecting an edge, in said scanning direction, of another medium to be printed, the edge being guided by said fixed guide...

In view of the similarity between these requirements and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claim 14. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 is patentably distinguishable over the cited Oda reference *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Thus, the allowance of this claim is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

V. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Dependent Claim 11

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oda (5,277,506) in view of Wen (6,109,745). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

Claim 11 incorporates all the novel and non-obvious features of its base claim 1. For *at least* the reasons already discussed above, Oda fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1. Moreover, Wen fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Oda. Therefore, claim 11 is patentable over the cited references *at least* by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

B. Independent claim 13

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oda (5,277,506). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

Independent claim 14 recites (among other things):

...moving a movable guide in said scanning direction;

detecting an edge that is guidable by a fixed guide, in said scanning direction, of said medium to be printed...

In view of the similarity between these requirements and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 1 demonstrate the patentability of claim 13. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Thus, the allowance of this claim is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 1, 2007